

Exhibit 7

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • FAX: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

TO: All Design Review Board Committee Members

FROM: Will Travis, Executive Director (415/352-3653 travis@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3670 ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Approved Minutes for May 5, 2003 Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at 6:35p.m. Other Board members in attendance included Ephraim Hirsch, Jacque Keller, Michael Smiley and Steve Thompson. Also in attendance was the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Design Advisory Committee. Members in attendance included: Amy Coburn, Amit Ghosh and Dan Hodapp. BCDC Staff in attendance included Bob Batha, Andrea Gaut, Michelle Levenson, and Ellen Miramontes.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for March 10, 2003 and April 7, 2003.** Mr. Kriken asked the Board if there were any changes to or deletions from the draft minutes of March 10, 2003 or the draft minutes of April 7, 2003. As there were none, Mr. Thompson made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Keller seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. **Piers 11/2, 3 and 5-Piers Preservation Project, City and County of San Francisco (Focused Fourth Review).** The Design Review Board held a public hearing on a proposal to convert the Piers 11/2, 3 (portion) and 5 complex into a mixture of office, restaurant/café, and retail uses within the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is bounded by the Pier 7 public plaza and pier to the north, Pier 1 to the south, Herb Caen Way and the Embarcadero roadway to the west, and the Bay to the east. As currently proposed, the Pier 11/2 bulkhead building would contain a mixture of office and restaurant uses on the first floor and office uses on the second floor. An additional restaurant is proposed bayward of the Pier 11/2 bulkhead building within the historic Delta King and Queen passenger waiting room. Floats for excursion boats, water taxis, and temporary tie-ups would occur bayward of the restaurant. The Pier 3 pier shed would be open to public and vehicular access on the first floor, with office uses occurring to the north and south within the pier shed and Pier 3 bulkhead buildings. The northern portion of the Pier 3 bulkhead building would also contain retail and café uses. The southern portion of the Pier 5 bulkhead building would contain office uses while the northern portion would be renovated into a café with outdoor seating. Public access associated with the project would consist of a wooden planked walkway that would extend around the perimeters of the bulkhead buildings, pier shed, and historic waiting room. In addition portions of the Bayside History Walk are proposed within the Pier 11/2 bulkhead building, between Piers 11/2 and 3 and through the Pier 3 pier shed. No parking is proposed. The project design had changed since the Board's last review of the project to respond to comments from the California State Lands Commission. In particular, the current proposal involves moving the location of the public access proposed bayward of the Pier 5 bulkhead building so it is against the building,



Making San Francisco Bay Better

**DRB MINUTES
May 5, 2003**

thereby eliminating the ten-foot-wide water separation that was previously proposed between the public access and the building.

a. **Staff and Project Presentation.** Ms. Michelle Levenson introduced the project and specifically asked the Board to consider the proposed project revision which involves eliminating a ten-foot-wide water separation between the interior edge of the port walk and the edge of the Pier 5 bulkhead building and increasing the width of the port walk by two feet. Ms. Levenson then introduced Simon Snellgrove of San Francisco Waterfront Partners who briefly described the changes that had been made to the project due to concerns that the California State Lands Commission had expressed. Richard Hannum of Hannum Associates then described the project revisions at the port walk in more detail and also reviewed changes that had been made to the building, the light fixtures and the docks.

b. **Board Questions.** Steve Thompson asked whether the small cutout of water at the north end of the port walk was the only remaining open water area still exposed under the new design. This was confirmed and it was also explained that this water area was provided in order to prevent there from being a hidden corner where someone could hide. Ephraim Hirsch asked whether this same safety problem would exist at the northeastern corner of the Pier 5 bulkhead building as well. It was explained that this area would probably have a lot more foot traffic and also would be more visually exposed since it is located directly adjacent to the Pier 7 public promenade.

Michael Smiley asked whether there were other reasons why the port walk had been moved next to the building besides to satisfy the California State Lands Commission's concerns. Mr. Hannum explained that the changes were made to both satisfy the California State Lands Commission and also due to structural constraints.

John Kriken asked what the function of the area between the port walk and the Pier 5 bulkhead building was. Mr. Hannum explained that this area would function as private tenant space and that there had been a desire to clearly separate the public and private space. Mr. Hannum also clarified that there would not be any entry onto the port walk from the private area for the entire length of the port walk. The private tenants would only be able to access the port walk from the same points where the public would access it.

Dan Hodapp asked why the location and number of the belvederes had changed. Mr. Hannum explained that the two large ones were located on axis with the building entries and the smaller ones were then spaced between. He further explained that the belvederes would provide an opportunity to step away from the building in order to better view it.

Amy Coburn asked why a three-foot-extension had been provided beyond the outside edge of the railing along the port walk. It was explained that this space would provide a space for tie-ups to cleats and a place to jump onto for visiting boaters.

Amit Ghosh asked for confirmation that all of the proposed lights near the restaurant seating had been removed and that the only new lights were located behind the line of the Pier 5 building. This was confirmed.

c. **Public Comment.** Ernestine Wise asked whether the benches would be divided, what color they would be and also how the public access area would be lighted.

d. **Board Discussion.** Mr. Thompson stated that he liked the bench edge along the port walk, the simplified light fixtures and the fact that the number of belvederes had been minimized. Although he would like for there to be more gaps exposing open water and wondered whether several more could be added intermittently along the walk.

Mr. Hirsch expressed concern about skateboarders damaging the seatwall. Mr. Hannum stated that the seatwalls would have metal clips or grooves to prevent skateboarders from using the seatwall. Ms. Keller later stated that there are many other solutions besides using the metal clips to prevent skateboarding such as intermittent protrusions or concave grooves along the seatwall.

Mr. Smiley expressed disappointment at losing the water separation while Mr. Kriken expressed that he thought the previous water separation was unnatural. Ms. Coburn agreed that the water opening was an odd condition.

Mr. Hodapp shared that he liked the revised design since he thought it was simpler and more industrial and as a result was more appropriate along the back of these buildings which had previously served as the service side of the buildings. He also stated that he didn't think it would be appropriate to add more water openings but would rather keep it as simple as possible. He said that he wanted to discuss the number of belvederes further as he felt there should be even fewer. He also stated that the lighting should be further simplified and questioned whether pole lights were the appropriate way to light the port walk. He suggested that a combination of bollards and down lights from the building be used instead so that the pole lights on Pier 7 could stand alone.

Mr. Ghosh agreed with Mr. Hodapp that he felt down lights from the building would be more appropriate. Mr. Kriken stated that the light source should be high enough so that faces are lit.

Ms. Coburn stated that she felt the proposed lights were not well-integrated with the other elements and details along the port walk. She stated that the lights were very contemporary whereas the outboard railing was very historic and the inboard railing was very utilitarian. She asked why there was not great coherence amongst the details.

Mr. Thompson stated that he liked the pole lights selected and Mr. Kriken stated that he felt the pole lights should stay as they helped to define the edge of the port walk.

Ms. Keller suggested that there be some consistency with the planted pots within the private tenant space and also stated that she wouldn't recommend using stamped concrete on the port walk since it often cracks. She suggested using interlocking pavers or unit pavers instead.

Mr. Smiley expressed concern about the mix of site furniture. He stated that the proposed bench and light do not work well together and also that the proposed pole light does not fit with the historic base. He stated that there should be some consistency amongst the site furniture from Pier 1 to 5.

Mr. Hodapp stated that he felt the site furniture could vary within the project. Mr. Ghosh, Mr. Smiley and Ms. Coburn agreed that the site furniture could vary but it was important that it all hold together and be responsive to the adjacent buildings.

e. **Board Summary.** The main recommendations of the Board included the following:

- (1) Explore skateboard proofing measures which do not involve using the metal clips.
- (2) Study the proposed lights further, specifically considering how the proposed modern lights fit with the proposed historic base, and also look at how they work with the other site furniture and details such as paving and railings.
- (3) The proposed number of belvederes is appropriate.
- (4) There should be a uniform approach to landscaping within the raised private tenant space next to the building.

The Board stated that they did not need to review the project again and would like staff to ensure that their comments were followed.

4. **Westpoint Marina, Redwood City (First Review).** The Design Review Board held a public hearing on a development proposal for a marina and boatyard that would be located at a site formerly used as a bittern pond by the Cargill Salt Company, southeast of the Pacific Shores Center development, off Seaport Boulevard, and west of Greco Island Westpoint Slough, in the City of Redwood City, San Mateo County. The project would be comprised of a full-service harbor facility and destination marina including 416 boat slips, on-shore covered and uncovered storage for small craft, two haul-out bays, a two-lane public launch ramp, hull and mechanical shops, a sail loft, rigging, canvas, rail, electrical and shipwright facilities. The project would also include a public boardwalk facing the marina basin with various amenities associated with a marina resort including a harbormaster's office, fuel dock, yacht club, restaurant, marine store, and retail spaces.

a. **Recusal.** Michael Smiley recused himself from the Board prior to the presentation of the project since he is currently working on the project.

b. **Staff and Project Presentation.** Andrea Gaut introduced the project and reviewed the four issues which had been raised in the staff summary: (1) would the proposed public access area accommodate the number of individuals and variety of uses that would likely occur; (2) is the site plan designed to provide usable and inviting public spaces that are oriented to the Bay; (3) does the site plan allow clear and continuous connections along and to the shoreline; and (4) do the public spaces include the appropriate types and number of amenities or are there other amenities, such as fishing facilities, that would be appropriate for this site and would improve the public's enjoyment of the shoreline. Ms. Gaut then introduced the project applicant, Mark Sanders, who described the project. Mr. Sanders then introduced the project landscape architect, Tim Hurley of BMS Design Group, and the project engineer, Pete Bohley of Bohley Consulting. Mr. Hurley described the context of the site, existing conditions, the proposed site plan and the proposed public access component.

c. **Board Questions.** Mr. Kriken asked about the shape of water basin and Mr. Sanders explained that the shape had been designed so as to avoid stagnant water within the basin. Mr. Kriken also stated that it would be desirable to mix up some of the uses, such as placing the boat launching closer to the public uses so that the public could enjoy watching these activities. Mr. Sanders explained that he had been advised to move the boat ramp to this location in order to provide a more efficient layout.

Mr. Hirsch asked whether the applicant would be relying up on the tidal flow in order to clean out the basin. Mr. Sanders confirmed that he would and added that he would dredge to 14 feet in depth and that the tidal surge was six feet. Mr. Sanders further stated that no dredging would be required for thirty years following construction.

Ms. Keller expressed concern regarding how the dredged material would be handled and where it would be placed. Mr. Sanders explained that they would spread the mud on the upland surface and let it dry by employing a wicking method to remove the water.

Mr. Hirsch asked whether the existing levy would hold. Mr. Sanders explained that it would and also that they would be increasing the levy slopes.

d. **Public Comment.** Ralph Nobles, who described himself as a local environmentalist concerned with preserving the health of the Bay, shared his whole-hearted support for the project. He viewed the removal of the bittern pond and the addition of 14 acres of new deep water to the Bay as a positive change and also stated that the presence of a harbormaster at the marina would help provide oversight on Greco Island.

Robert Hoffman, who has been a recreational boater in Redwood City for 55 years, stated that the project would be a first class marina. He added that a marina, boatyard and fuel dock were much needed in the South Bay since many marina berths were being lost to condominium developments.

Kent Mitchell, who has been involved with the Stanford Rowing Crew since 1957, explained that approximately 350 people row in this area weekly and that all three of the current access points were slated to be removed. He further added that this area provided one of the best rowing areas in the country. He stated his full support of the project.

Bob Wilson, a resident of Redwood Shores, expressed his strong support of the project. He explained that the project would provide the opportunity for many people to appreciate the Bay and that it would be a great project for boaters.

e. **Board Discussion.** Mr. Hirsch stated he thought the project was a good one. Mr. Kriken also stated his support for the project and explained that it would be a valued contribution to the Bay. He encouraged the applicant to find ways to mix the boating and retail uses. Mr. Thompson suggested putting a public facility on the boathouse side of the project such as a restaurant on the second floor of the crew facility.

Ms. Keller asked that the areas on either side of the basin mouth be developed further with an emphasis on drawing the public to the harbor gate and fostering views to Greco Island.

Mr. Thompson commented that the approximately half-mile long parking lot on the southern edge of the project was not ideal and suggested looking at ways to break this up and also, in general, to pursue the use of environmentally sensitive stormwater runoff techniques. He also suggested further breaking up the office and retail buildings on the north side of the project.

f. **Board Summary.** The main recommendations of the Board included the following:

(1) Mix up the uses more by placing some commercial uses by the boatyard and putting some marina functions by the retail area so that public users may benefit from and enjoy the marina activity.

(2) Develop the areas on either side of the marina basin opening further so that these points draw the public to the harbor mouth and foster views to Greco Island.

(3) Try to break up the parking lot on the southern edge of the project by providing more stopping points.

(4) Break up the building masses on the northern side of the project.

(5) Describe how various user groups would be involved with the site.

(6) Employ environmentally sensitive stormwater runoff techniques.

The Board stated that they would like to review the project again.

6. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections, at the
Design Review Board Meeting
of July 7, 2003.

JOHN KRIKEN
Chairman